



3728

Practitioner's Docket No.

P-1000

PATENT

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Stefan O. Dick, et al.

Application No.: 09/649,903 ✓ Group No.: 3728 ✓

Filed: Aug. 28, 2000 ✓ Examiner: Mohandes, Jila M. ✓

For: PACKAGING CONTAINER FOR ELECTRONIC COMPONENTS

Confirmation No. 7709 ✓

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

## AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL

**WARNING:** Failure to file a complete response in compliance with § 1.135(c) leads to a reduction in patent term adjustment - See § 1.704(c)(7).

1. Transmitted herewith is an amendment for this application.

## STATUS

RECEIVED

2. Applicant is

a small entity. A statement:  
 is attached.  
 was already filed.  
 other than a small entity.

FEB 19 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

## CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.8(a) and 1.10\*

(When using Express Mail, the Express Mail label number is mandatory;  
Express Mail certification is optional.)

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being:

## MAILING

deposited with the United States Postal Service in an envelope addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231

37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)

37 C.F.R. § 1.10 \*

with sufficient postage as first class mail.  as "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee"

Mailing Label No. \_\_\_\_\_ (mandatory)

## TRANSMISSION

facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office, (703) \_\_\_\_\_

Signature

Date: Feb. 5, 2003

Dorothy Goodlett

(type or print name of person certifying)

\* Only the date of filing (§ 1.6) will be the date used in a patent term adjustment calculation, although the date on any certificate of mailing or transmission under § 1.8 continues to be taken into account in determining timeliness. See § 1.703(f). Consider "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" (§ 1.10) or facsimile transmission (§ 1.6(d)) for the reply to be accorded the earliest possible filing date for patent term adjustment calculations.

## EXTENSION OF TERM

NOTE: "Extension of Time in Patent Cases (Supplement Amendments) — If a timely and complete response has been filed after a Non-Final Office Action, an extension of time is not required to permit filing and/or entry of an additional amendment after expiration of the shortened statutory period.

If a timely response has been filed after a Final Office Action, an extension of time is required to permit filing and/or entry of a Notice of Appeal or filing and/or entry of an additional amendment after expiration of the shortened statutory period unless the timely-filed response placed the application in condition for allowance. Of course, if a Notice of Appeal has been filed within the shortened statutory period, the period has ceased to run." Notice of December 10, 1985 (1061 O.G. 34-35).

NOTE: See 37 C.F.R. § 1.645 for extensions of time in interference proceedings, and 37 C.F.R. § 1.550(c) for extensions of time in reexamination proceedings.

NOTE: 37 C.F.R. § 1.704(b) "...an applicant shall be deemed to have failed to engage in reasonable efforts to conclude processing or examination of an application for the cumulative total of any periods of time in excess of three months that are taken to reply to any notice or action by the Office making any rejection, objection, argument, or other request, measuring such three-month period from the date the notice or action was mailed or given to the applicant, in which case the period of adjustment set forth in § 1.703 shall be reduced by the number of days, if any, beginning on the day after the date that is three months after the date of mailing or transmission of the Office communication notifying the applicant of the rejection, objection, argument, or other request and ending on the date the reply was filed. The period, or shortened statutory period, for reply that is set in the Office action or notice has no effect on the three-month period set forth in this paragraph."

3. The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 apply.

(complete (a) or (b), as applicable)

(a)  Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136  
(fees: 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a)(1)-(4) for the total number of months checked below:

<u>Extension (months)</u>	<u>Fee for other than small entity</u>	<u>Fee for small entity</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> one month	\$ 110.00	\$ 55.00
<input type="checkbox"/> two months	\$ 400.00	\$ 200.00
<input type="checkbox"/> three months	\$ 920.00	\$ 460.00
<input type="checkbox"/> four months	\$ 1,440.00	\$ 720.00

Fee: \$\_\_\_\_\_

If an additional extension of time is required, please consider this a petition therefor.

(check and complete the next item, if applicable)

An extension for \_\_\_\_\_ months has already been secured. The fee paid therefor of \$\_\_\_\_\_ is deducted from the total fee due for the total months of extension now requested.

Extension fee due with this request \$\_\_\_\_\_

OR

(b)  Applicant believes that no extension of term is required. However, this is a conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition for extension of time.

## FEE F R CLAIMS

4. The fee for claims (37 C.F.R. § 1.16(b)-(d)) has been calculated as shown below:

(Col. 1)	(Col. 2)	(Col. 3)	SMALL ENTITY	OTHER THAN A SMALL ENTITY	
CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	HIGHEST NO PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA	RATE	ADDIT. FEE	OR
					ADDIT. FEE
TOTAL . . . 17	MINUS .. 21	= 0	x\$9= \$		x\$18= \$
INDEP. . . 2	MINUS ... 4	= 0	x\$42= \$		x\$84= \$
<input type="checkbox"/> FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEP. CLAIM			+\$140= \$		+\$280= \$
			TOTAL ADDIT. FEE \$	OR	TOTAL ADDIT. FEE \$

- If the entry in Col. 1 is less than entry in Col. 2, write "0" in Col. 3.
- If the "Highest No. Previously Paid for" IN THIS SPACE is less than 20, enter "20."
- If the "Highest No. Previously Paid For" IN THIS SPACE is less than 3, enter "3."
- The "Highest No. Previously Paid For" (Total or indep.) is the highest number found in the appropriate box in Col. 1 of a prior amendment or the number of claims originally filed.

**WARNING:** "After final rejection or action (§ 1.113) amendments may be made cancelling claims or complying with any requirement of form which has been made." 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(a) (emphasis added).

(complete (c) or (d), as applicable)

(c)  No additional fee for claims is required.

OR

(d)  Total additional fee for claims required \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

## FEE PAYMENT

- Attached is a  check  money order in the amount of \$ \_\_\_\_\_.
- Authorization is hereby made to charge the amount of \$ \_\_\_\_\_
  - to Deposit Account No. \_\_\_\_\_
  - to Credit card as shown on the attached credit card information authorization form PTO-2038.

**WARNING:** Credit card information should not be included on this form as it may become public.

Charge any additional fees required by this paper or credit any overpayment in the manner authorized above.

A duplicate of this paper is attached.

## FEE DEFICIENCY

**NOTE:** If there is a fee deficiency and there is no authorization to charge an account, additional fees are necessary to cover the additional time consumed in making up the original deficiency. If the maximum, six-month period has expired before the deficiency is noted and corrected, the application is held abandoned. In those instances where authorization to charge is included, processing delays are encountered in returning the papers to the PTO Finance Branch in order to apply these charges prior to action on the cases. Authorization to charge the deposit account for any fee deficiency should be checked. See the Notice of April 7, 1986, (1065 O.G. 31-33).

6.  If any additional extension and/or fee is required, charge Account  
No. 03-3420

## AND/OR

If any additional fee for claims is required, charge Account  
No. 03-3420



SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Reg. No.: 31,945

Scott R. Cox  
(type or print name of practitioner)

Tel. No.: ( 502 ) 589-4215.

400 West Market St., Suite 2200  
P.O. Address

Customer No.:

Louisville, KY 40202



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of :  
Stefan O. Dick, et al. :  
Serial No. 09/649,903 :  
Filing Date: Aug. 28, 2000 :  
Attorney Docket No. P-1000 :  
For: PACKAGING CONTAINER FOR  
ELECTRONIC COMPONENTS :  
Art Unit: 3728  
Examiner:  
Mohandes, Jila M.  
Confirmation No. 7709

RECEIVED

FEB 19 2003

Box Non-Fee Amendment  
Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

**AMENDMENT**

This is an amendment in response to the Office Action of the United States Patent and Trademark Office dated November 5, 2002.

**Remarks/Arguments**

Claims 1-17 remain in the application. Cancel Claims 18-21. Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S. Section 103 as being unpatentable over Pakeriasamy, U.S. Patent No. 5,857,573 in view of Lancesseur, U.S. Patent No. 5,432,214. In addition, Claims 2, 3 and 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pakeriasamy and Lancesseur, as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of a third patent, Martin, et al., U.S.

78B  
by  
Beore  
E. Martin  
2/21/03